

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 20, 27, 34, 43, 44, 55, and 66 have been amended, while no claims have been cancelled and no claims are new. Claims 1-77 therefore remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not introduce new matter. Support for the claim amendments can be found in at least claim 8 and page 7, lines 17-18 of the written description.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 16-18, 20, 21, 24-28, 34-37, 40-45, and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,343,217 (Borland) in view of U.S. Publication 2004/0010729 A1 (Lockridge et al.).

Claims 3, 4, 11-15, 19, 22, 23, 29-33, 38, 39, 46-50, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borland in view of Lockridge et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,307,859 (Tedenstig).

Claims 55-60, 63-68, and 74-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borland in view of Lockridge et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,561,454 (White, III).

Claims 61, 62, 69-73, and 77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borland and Lockridge et al. in view of White, III, and further in view of Tedenstig.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the independent claims for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

THE CLAIMS

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a system for interfacing with at least one node in a Fibre Channel network, the system comprising (added language underlined):

- an input interface to receive a plurality of frames of data, transmitted and/or received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network; and
- an output interface to provide the received frames of data to a device, wherein at least one of the input interface and the output interface is further configured to time tag the received plurality of frames of data prior to the providing of the frames of data to the device, and
- wherein the device includes a recorder to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges Borland in view of Lockridge et al. renders claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 1.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Borland in view of Lockridge et al. at least fails to teach or suggest:

“wherein *the device includes a recorder* to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network”

Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Borland appears to be directed towards “communicating an audio signal from a transmitter unit to a remote receiver unit.” Abstract. The Office acknowledges that “Borland fails to disclose a system, wherein at least one of the input interface and the output interface is further configured to time tag the received plurality of frames of data prior to the providing of the frames of data to the device.” Applicant agrees.

Lockridge et al. appears to be directed towards “a system level clocking scheme to remove jitter from multi-media packets distributed over an asynchronous network . . . by using various time stamps.” Abstract. Additionally, the Office has stated that “[t]he motivation for implementing a system comprising a time tagging element to time tag data frames prior to the providing of the data frames to the device is that it enables synchronization of the system.”

However, Borland in view of Lockridge et al. does not teach or suggest “a recorder to record the frames of data transmitted and received” as recited in claim 1. During the aforementioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree that these amendments would make claim 1 allowable over the references of record. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Claims 2-19 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Applicant therefore submits that each of claims 2-19 is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 1.

Independent Claim 20, as amended, recites a system for interfacing with at least one node in a Fibre Channel network, the system comprising (added language underlined):

- an input interface to receive a plurality of frames of data, transmitted and/or received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network;
- an output interface to provide the received frames of data in pulse code modulation (PCM) formatted frames to a device, wherein at least one of the input interface and the output interface is further configured to time tag the received plurality of frames of data prior to the providing of the frames of data to the device, and
- wherein the device includes a recorder to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network; and
- a processor coupled to control the input interface and the output interface.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges Borland in view of Lockridge et al. renders claim 20 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 20.

As mentioned above in reference to claim 1, Borland in view of Lockridge et al. at least fails to teach or suggest:

“wherein the device includes a recorder to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network”

Claim 20 (emphasis added).

During the aforementioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree that these amendments would make claim 20 allowable over the references of record. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least these reasons, claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 21-33 depend from claim 20, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Claims 21-33 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicant submits that each of claims 21-33 is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 20.

Independent Claim 34, as amended, recites a Fibre Channel network comprising (added language underlined):

- a first port configured to at least one of transmit and receive a plurality of frames of data;
- a second port configured to transmit a plurality of frames of data;
- a third port configured to at least one of transmit and receive a plurality of frames of data;
- a fourth port configured to transmit a plurality of frames of data;
- a first network device having a first node coupled to the first port;
- at least one second network device having a second node coupled to the third port; and
- a system operatively coupled to and configured to interface with the first and second nodes, the system including:
 - an input interface to receive a plurality of frames of data, transmitted and/or received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network; and
 - an output interface to provide the received frames of data to a device, wherein at least one of the input interface and the output interface is further configured to time tag the received plurality of frames of data prior to the providing of the frames of data to the device, and
 - wherein the device includes a recorder to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges Borland in view of Lockridge et al. renders claim 34 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 34.

As mentioned above in reference to claims 1 and 20, Applicant respectfully submits that Borland in view of Lockridge et al. at least fails to teach or suggest:

“wherein *the device includes a recorder* to record the frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network”

Claim 34 (emphasis added).

During the aforementioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree that these amendments would make claim 34 allowable over the references of record. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least these reasons, claim 34 is allowable.

Claims 35-54 depend from claim 34, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Claims 35-54 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicant submits that each of claims 35-54 is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 34.

Independent Claim 55, as amended, recites an aircraft comprising (added language underlined):

- a fuselage;
- at least one engine;
- lift generating surfaces; and
- a plurality of avionics units networked with a Fibre Channel network, the network including:
- a first port configured to at least one of transmit and receive a plurality of frames of data;

- a second port configured to transmit a plurality of frames of data;
- a third port configured to at least one of transmit and receive a plurality of frames of data;
- a fourth port configured to transmit a plurality of frames of data;
- a first network device having a first node coupled to the first port;
- at least a second network device having a second node coupled to the third port; and
- a system for interfacing with the first and second nodes, the system including:
 - an input interface to receive a plurality of frames of data, transmitted and/or received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network; and
 - an output interface to provide the received frames of data to a device, wherein at least one of the input interface and the output interface is further configured to time tag the received plurality of frames of data prior to the providing of the frames of data to the device, and
 - wherein the device includes a recorder to create a recording of the received plurality of frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges that Borland in view of Lockridge et al., and further in view of White, III renders claim 55 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 55.

As discussed above, Borland in view of Lockridge et al. fails to teach or suggest:

“wherein the device includes a recorder to create a recording of the received plurality of frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network.”

Claim 55 (emphasis added).

White, III was cited for its alleged teaching of “a network hub . . . installed within an aircraft.” However, White, III fails to remedy the deficiencies of Borland and Lockridge et al. noted above. For example, White, III fails to disclose or suggest “wherein the device includes a recorder to create a recording of the received plurality of frames of data transmitted and received at the at least one node in the Fibre Channel network” as recited in claim 55. During the aforementioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree that these amendments would make claim 55 allowable over the references of record. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least these reasons, claim 55 is allowable.

Claims 56-77 depend from claim 55, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Claims 56-77 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicant submits that each of claims 56-77 is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 55.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-77 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issues remain unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a phone call to discuss the issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2008

By: /David A. Divine/
David A. Divine
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 51,275
(509) 324-9256 x233